

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for her courtesy and consideration in discussing this Application in a telephone interview on February 12, 2010. During the interview, the Decision from the Board was discussed. It was agreed that the Applicants would integrate allowable aspects from independent claims 14 and 28 into the remainder of the independent claims in this Amendment, and that the Examiner would issue a Notice of Allowance thereafter. Again, Applicants thank the Examiner for collaborating to move this application forward.

Status of the Claims

Before this Amendment, claims 1-14, 17-24, 26 and 28 were present for examination. Claims 1 and 22 are amended to substantially incorporate allowable subject matter from claims 14 and 28. Therefore, claims 1-14, 17-24, 26 and 28 are present for examination, and claims 1, 14, 22, and 28 are the independent claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in light of the interview.

On December 16, 2009, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences decided that the Office had erred in rejecting independent claims 14 and 28 (Board Decision, p. 12, ll. 19 and 20). Specifically, the Board decided that “[t]he Appellants’ final argument is compelling First we find that the argument regarding the web interface is applicable to independent claims 14 and 28 . . . [The prior art] does not describe a web interface that allows users to remotely interact with service contract information and thereby modify the threshold.” (Board Decision, p. 11, l. 23 – p. 12, l. 3).

As agreed in the interview, the following language is integrated into independent claims 1 and 22: “the threshold event set by a user with a web interface allowing remote modification of the service contract to thereby modify the threshold event.”

It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 14, 22, and 28 are allowable for at least the above reasons. Claims 2-13, 17-21, 23, 24, and 26 each depend from the independent claims, and these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reason of their

dependence from an allowable base claim. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Further, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment in connection with this paper to Deposit Account No. 20-1430.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael L. Drapkin
Reg. No. 55,127

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
MLD:s5k
62452474 v1